



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,286	11/18/2003	Sriram Devanathan	592-L	6071

34225 7590 05/12/2006

UNISYS CORP.  
25725 JERONIMO ROAD, MS400  
MISSION VIEJO, CA 92691

EXAMINER
----------

SYED, FARHAN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2165

DATE MAILED: 05/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/716,286	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DEVANATHAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Farhan M. Syed	<b>Art Unit</b> 2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 November 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-38 are pending.

***Drawings***

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: Figure 5, block 506; Figure 9, block 916; and Figure 10, block 1010. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: Figure 14, block 1404; and Figure 21, block 2114. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to

Art Unit: 2165

avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "block 1408," in Figure 14, has been used to designate both "Is CWM Data-Type User-Defined?" and "Is CWM Data Type Text?." Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

5. 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, requires the specification to be written in "full, clear, concise, and exact terms." The specification is replete with terms which are not clear, concise and exact. The specification should be revised carefully in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Examples of some unclear, inexact or verbose terms used in the specification are: design items, design libraries, design model, subject areas, and generalization.

### ***Double Patenting***

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).  
A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).  
Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-3, 13-17, and 27-29 provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3, 21-23, and 41-43 of copending Application No. 10/716,287. Although the conflicting

claims are not identical, they are not patentable distinct from each other because they are substantially similar in scope and they use the same limitations.

Claims 1-3, 21-23, and 41-43 of 10/716,287 reference recites all the elements of claims 1-3, 13-17, and 27-29 of the instant application 10/716,286 and as such anticipates claims 1-3, 13-17, and 27-29 of the instant application.

"A later patent claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim if the later claim is obvious over, or anticipated by, the earlier claim. In re Longi, 759 F.2d at 896, 225 USPQ at 651 (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patents); In re Berg, 140 F.3d at 1437, 46 USPQ2d at 1233 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting where a patent application claim to a genus is anticipated by a patent claim to a species within that genus)." ELI LILLY AND COMPANY v. BARR LABORATORIES, INC., United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, ON PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC (DECIDED: May 30, 2001).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to omit the additional elements of claims 1-3, 21-23, and 41-43 to arrive at the claims 1-3, 13-17, and 27-29 of the instant application because the person would have realized that the remaining element would perform the same functions as before. "Omissions of element and its function in combination is obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform same functions as before." See In re Karlson (CCPA) 136 USPQ 184, decide Jan 16, 1963, App. No. 6857, U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1, 15, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear to the Examiner as to what the "logical aspects" of the common warehouse model is. Although on page 6 of the Applicant's specifications does state "... the logical information or aspects are usually represented by entity-relationship (ER) diagrams..," it lacks a precise definition of what that term means, since one can argue that "computer data" is usually represented by an ER diagram. Furthermore, it is unclear to the Examiner as to what "design items," "design libraries," and "design models" are. The Applicant fails to provide a more precise meaning of those terms, such as providing examples of the respective terms. The Applicant does state on page 7 of the specification "For the output, logical elements typically found in design tools with logical modeling support with be referred to as design <name>." However, this argument fails to satisfy the Examiner's understanding of the term. Therefore, the Examiner will assume that the Applicant is referring to a relational database schema and the properties associated with such schema.

9. Claim 4, 5, 8, 18, 19, 22, 30, 31 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims recite "ER subject areas," but fail to disclose what subject areas are. The Applicant recites on page 14 of the specification "Subject areas constitute a way of organizing the tables for understanding purposes (note that tables are only linked to the subject areas, not included therein)." What type of a way does subject areas organizing the tables? Can tables be organized alphabetically? Are subject areas primary keys of a source table that are linked to other tables as foreign keys? The Examiner will assume that the ER subject area refers to a relational schema.

10. Claims 7, 10, 21, 24, 33, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims recite the term "generalization." The Applicant fails to define the term in the specification, as to what the scope and meaning of generalization is. On page 16 of the Applicant's specification, it recites "To represent generalization in the relational database, process 700 creates an inheritance link from the corresponding child design domain to the corresponding parent design domain (block 714)." Is the Examiner to infer that generalization is a process to create an inheritance link from the child domain to the parent domain? It is unclear what



the Applicant's intent is in using the concept of generalization, therefore the Examiner will assume that generalization means a reference from one pointer to another.

11. Claims 10, 24, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims recite the term "entity subtype relationship," where the Examiner fails to understand the meaning of "entity subtype relationship." On page 17 of the Applicant's specification, the Applicant recites the flow chart for Figure 10 that illustrates the processing of the entity subtype relationships, but fails to define the exact meaning of such a term. The Examiner will assume that the entity subtype relationships are such relationships that are a secondary relationship between a parent and child domain.

12. Claims 11, 25, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims recite the term "non-subtype relationship," where the Examiner fails to understand the meaning of "entity subtype relationship." On page 17 of the Applicant's specification, the Applicant recites the flow chart for Figures 11A and 11B that illustrates the processing of the non-subtype relationships, but fails to define the exact meaning of such a term. The Examiner will assume that the non-subtype relationships are such relationships that do not establish a secondary relationship between a parent and child domain.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

13. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 15 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As per claim 15, the claim clearly recite a "An article of manufacture comprising of: a machine-accessible medium including data that, when accessed by a machine, causes the machine to perform the operation of." The Applicant uses the word "machine-accessible medium" on page 10 of the specification, which recites "the program or code segments can be stored in a process or a machine accessible medium or transmitted by a computer data signal embodied in a carrier wave, or a signal modulated by a carrier, over a transmission medium. Examples of the processor readable or machine accessible medium include an electronic circuit, a semiconductor memory device, a read only memory (ROM), a flash memory, an erasable ROM (EROM), a floppy diskette, a compact disk (CD) ROM, an optical disk, a hard disk, a fiber optic medium, a radio frequency (RF) link, etc. The computer data signal may include any signal that can propagate over a transmission medium such as electronic network channels, optical fiber, air, electromagnetic, RF links, etc." Based on these references, the Examiner understands that implementing the claim mentioned above would render the result of the claim as intangible. A signal-bearing medium is not

Art Unit: 2165

tangible, and cannot tangibly embody a computer program or process since a computer cannot understand/realize (i.e. execute) the computer program or process when embodied on the data signal. Computer program or processes are only realized within the computer when stored in a memory or storage element (such as RAM or ROM). Therefore, a data signal does not meet the "useful, concrete, and tangible" requirement as set forth in *State Street*, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02, and hence claims 25-32 are non statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101.

As per claim 21, the claim clearly recite a "A memory coupled to the processor, the memory containing program code that, when executed by the processor, causes the processor to perform the operation." The Applicant uses the word "program code" on page 10 of the specification, which recites "the program or code segments can be stored in a process or a machine accessible medium or transmitted by a computer data signal embodied in a carrier wave, or a signal modulated by a carrier, over a transmission medium. Examples of the processor readable or machine accessible medium include an electronic circuit, a semiconductor memory device, a read only memory (ROM), a flash memory, an erasable ROM (EROM), a floppy diskette, a compact disk (CD) ROM, an optical disk, a hard disk, a fiber optic medium, a radio frequency (RF) link, etc. The computer data signal may include any signal that can propagate over a transmission medium such as electronic network channels, optical fiber, air, electromagnetic, RF links, etc." Based on these references, the Examiner understands that implementing the claim mentioned above would render the result of

Art Unit: 2165

the claim as intangible. A signal-bearing medium is not tangible, and cannot tangibly embody a computer program or process since a computer cannot understand/realize (i.e. execute) the computer program or process when embodied on the data signal.

Computer program or processes are only realized within the computer when stored in a memory or storage element (such as RAM or ROM). Therefore, a data signal does not meet the "useful, concrete, and tangible" requirement as set forth in *State Street*, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02, and hence claims 25-32 are non statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

14. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

15. Claims 1, 13, 15, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by a non-patent literature titled "A Logical Design Methodology for Relational Database Using the Extended Entity-Relationship Model" by Toby J. Teorey, Dongqing Yang, and James P. Fry, ACM Computing Survey (CSUR), June 1986, vol. 18, issue 2 (and known hereinafter as Teorey).

As per claims 1, 13, 15, and 27, Teorey teaches a method comprising: converting logical aspects of a common warehouse model (CWM) to corresponding design items for a relational database by processing in a hierarchical manner the logical aspects and creating the corresponding design items, the logical aspects comprising entity-relationship (ER) libraries, the ER libraries comprising ER models, the corresponding design items comprising design libraries, the design libraries comprising design models (i.e. "A database design methodology is defined for the design of large relational databases. First, the data requirements are conceptualized using an extended entity-relationship model, with the extensions being additional semantics such as ternary relationships, optional relationships, and the generalization abstraction. The extended entity-relationship model is then decomposed according to a set of basic entity-relationship constructs, and these are transformed into candidate relations.")(Abstract).

16. Claims 1, 13, 15, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by a non-patent literature titled "Designing and Creating Relational Schemas with a CWM-Based Tool" by Kumpon Farpinyo and Twittie Senivongse, pages 456-461, 2002 (known hereinafter as Farpinyo).

As per claims 1, 13, 15, and 27, Farpinyo teaches a method comprising: converting logical aspects of a common warehouse model (CWM) to corresponding design items for a relational database by processing in a hierarchical manner the logical aspects and creating the corresponding design items, the logical aspects comprising entity-relationship (ER) libraries, the ER libraries comprising ER models, the corresponding design items comprising design libraries, the design libraries comprising

design models (i.e. *"This paper presents a design and development of a tool called ER2CWM that creates CWM relational database schemas from physical data models represented by ER diagrams. The tool supports the creation of ER diagrams, transformation into CWM format, and creation of database schemas for relational database management systems. It can also transform database schemas back into CWM and ER diagrams respectively."* "ER diagrams are generally used to express designs of relational databases [1]. There are tools, such as PowerDesigner [2] and Erwin [3], that can help database designers to design a database with ER diagrams and create database schemas. These tools usually support the reverse of the process to create ER diagrams from existing database schemas also. All these are done via intermediate schema representations that are specific to individual design tools. This means, for example, PowerDesigner and Erwin both have their own metadata format that represents ER models and is used to create database schemas. This situation is not convenient for the designers to export a database schema designed and created by one tool to other working environments since specific mapping between the metadata of the source environment and the one understood by the target will be required for each pair of the exchanging environment.") (Abstract; page 456, paragraph 1).

17. Claims 1, 13, 15, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shinjo (U.S. Patent Pub. 2004/0133581 A1).

As per claims 1, 13, 15, and 27, Shinjo teaches a method comprising: converting logical aspects of a common warehouse model (CWM) to corresponding design items for a relational database by processing in a hierarchical manner the logical aspects and creating the corresponding design items, the logical aspects comprising entity-relationship (ER) libraries, the ER libraries comprising ER models, the corresponding

design items comprising design libraries, the design libraries comprising design models (i.e. "When a relational database is generated, conceptual design, logical design, and physical design are required. In each designing process, a model of a set of data structure describing a data format, data relation, integrity constraint, etc. is generated as a schema. In the conceptual design, a concept model is generated by describing a part of a target real world in predetermined notation. In the logical design, a logical model is generated using a table, an index, and a data structure viewed from the user interface 110 (referred to as a "view") as a logical data structure of a practical database model. In the physical design, the representation format of the storage device of a hard disk, etc., a file organization, an access method, contents of data, etc. are determined. In the conceptual design, an entity relationship model (E-R model) is frequently used in representing a model of a target real world. In the entity relationship model, there are two concepts, that is, an "entity" and a "relation". An entity refers to an inclusive description of an object to be recognized when a database designer designs a model of a target real world. Various characteristics of an entity are represented by "attributes". A relation refers to a model of the correlation between two or more entities." The preceding text clearly indicates that an E-R model is frequently used to convert data from a source into a relational database. It is well known in the art that when creating a logical or conceptual design that there exists models and libraries within the ER-Model which corresponds to the models and libraries of a relational database. Although the primary reference does not refer to CWM, it is an intended use to convert CWM information into a relational database through an ER Model.)(page 1, paragraphs [009]-[0010]).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2-12, 14, 16-26, 28-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over a non-patent literature titled "A Logical Design Methodology for Relational Database Using the Extended Entity-Relationship Model" by Toby J. Teorey, Dongqing Yang, and James P. Fry, ACM Computing Survey (CSUR), June 1986, vol. 18, issue 2 (and known hereinafter as Teorey) in view of a non-patent literature titled "Designing and Creating Relational Schemas with a CWM-Based Tool" by Kumpon Farpinyo and Twittie Senivongse, pages 456-461, 2002 (known hereinafter as Farpinyo).

As per claims 2, Teorey does not explicitly teaches a method wherein converting comprises the operations of: (a) scanning through the ER libraries; (b) for a first of the ER libraries, creating a corresponding first design library; (c) for each of the ER models in the first ER library, creating a corresponding design model in the corresponding first design library to hold corresponding information; (d) processing each of the ER models to produce corresponding information for the corresponding design model; (e) determining if there are any references between the ER models; and (f) if there are any references between the ER models, specifying corresponding references in corresponding design models.

Farpinyo teaches a method wherein converting comprises the operations of: (a) scanning through the ER libraries (i.e. *"DBMS Information – This module, via JDBC, creates database schema from CWM Relational metadata, reads in existing database schemas to create CWM*



Art Unit: 2165

*Relational metadata and ER diagrams, and maintains information about DBMSes that ER2CWM supports, i.e. SQL data types and database commands for creating and reading in schemas. DBMSes on which ER2CWM have been tested are Sybase Adaptive Server v.11.9.2 [9] and Microsoft SQL Server 2000 [10]. Other DBMSes can be supported by providing ER2CWM with .jar files that contain corresponding DBMS information."* The preceding text clearly indicates that ER2CWM supports SQL data types and database commands for creating and reading schemas. It is clear that in order to create and read schemas, scanning of ER libraries must be performed. Figure 3 clearly illustrates such example.)(Page 459, paragraph 3); (b) for a first of the ER libraries, creating a corresponding first design library; (c) for each of the ER models in the first ER library, creating a corresponding design model in the corresponding first design library to hold corresponding information; (d) processing each of the ER models to produce corresponding information for the corresponding design model; (e) determining if there are any references between the ER models; and (f) if there are any references between the ER models, specifying corresponding references in corresponding design models (For the remainder of steps b-f are steps found in the user manual of the ER2CWM tool.)(Page 461, paragraph 1).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Teorey with the teachings of Farpinyo to include a method wherein converting comprises the operations of: (a) scanning through the ER libraries; (b) for a first of the ER libraries, creating a corresponding first design library; (c) for each of the ER models in the first ER library, creating a corresponding design model in the corresponding first design library to hold corresponding information; (d) processing each of the ER models to produce corresponding information for the corresponding design model; (e) determining if there are any references between the

ER models; and (f) if there are any references between the ER models, specifying corresponding references in corresponding design models with the motivation to facilitate database design, creation, and maintenance via a standard CWM format that can also be ported for use in other environments. (Farpinyo, Abstract).

As per claims 3, Teorey does not explicitly teach a method wherein, in operation (d), each of the ER models is processed independently.

Farpinyo teaches a method wherein, in operation (d), each of the ER models is processed independently (Figures 1-11 steps through the process of creating an ER model and then converting it into a relational database. This process is a continuous process, where each ER model is created independently from the other, until the user completes the desired relational database specifications.)(Figures 1-11).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Teorey with the teachings of Farpinyo to include a method wherein, in operation (d), each of the ER models is processed independently with the motivation to facilitate database design, creation, and maintenance via a standard CWM format that can also be ported for use in other environments. (Farpinyo, Abstract).

As per claim 4, Teorey teaches the method of processing entity subtype relationships in the first ER model (i.e. *"Adopting an ER extension called the entity-category-relationship model, Navathe and others have organized the different classes of objects and relationships into forms that are either compatible or incompatible for view integration. A category is defined as a*

*subset of entities from an entity type, thus representing a form of generalization hierarchy.*" The preceding text clearly indicates that subtype relationships are a subset of entities and the first ER model is an entity type.)(page 206, paragraph 5); and processing non-subtype relationships in the first ER model (i.e. *"The integration process is applied to four possible forms of object class similarity: identical domains, contained (subset) domains, overlapping domains, and disjointed domains."* The previous text clearly indicates that disjointed domains are a form of a non-subtype relationship within the ER model.)(page 206-207, paragraph 6).

Teorey does not explicitly teach a method wherein operation (d) comprises: processing ER subject areas included in a first of the ER models; processing ER domains included in the first ER model; processing domain inheritance for each of the ER domains; and processing ER entities included in the first ER model.

Farpinyo teaches a method wherein operation (d) comprises: processing ER subject areas included in a first of the ER models; processing ER domains included in the first ER model; processing domain inheritance for each of the ER domains; and processing ER entities included in the first ER model. (Figures 1-11 steps through the process of creating an ER model and then converting it into a relational database. This process is a continuous process, where each ER model is created independently from the other, until the user completes the desired relational database specifications.)(Figures 1-11).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Teorey with the teachings of Farpinyo to include a method wherein operation (d) comprises: processing ER subject areas included in a first of the ER models; processing ER domains included in the first ER model; processing domain inheritance for each of the ER domains; and processing ER entities included in the first ER model with the motivation to facilitate database design,

creation, and maintenance via a standard CWM format that can also be ported for use in other environments. (Farpinyo, Abstract).

As per claims 5, Teorey teaches a method wherein processing ER subject areas comprises: for each of the ER subject areas included in the first ER model, creating a corresponding design subject area in the corresponding first design model (i.e. "...third, it defines mappings between equivalent attributes of corresponding object classes." The previous text clearly indicates that attributes are associated to an ER model and object classes are associated to a relational database, thus establishing correspondence between an ER model and a relational database design model.)(page 206, paragraph 6).

As per claims 6, Teorey teaches a method wherein processing domains comprises: for each of the ER domains included in the first ER model, creating a corresponding design domain in the corresponding first design model (i.e. "The integration process is applied to four possible forms of object class similarity: identical domains, contained (subset) domains, overlapping domains, and disjoint domains." The preceding text clearly indicates that creating is integration process.)(Page 206-207, paragraph 6); determining parameters for each of the ER domains, including base type, default and constraint (i.e. "Relationships are classified in terms of their degree, the role of each object class in the relationship and various constraints, such as cardinality constraints that may differ among object classes." The previous text clearly illustrates a type of parameter for each ER domain such as type and constraint, where type is the role of each object class and constraint is an instance of various constraints.)(Page 207, paragraph 1); and setting corresponding parameters for each of the corresponding design domains.

As per claims 7, Teorey teaches a method wherein processing domain inheritance comprises: determining, for a first of the ER domains, whether there is a first generalization in the CWM that links the first ER domain (i.e. *"A generalization hierarchy occurs when an entity (which we call the generic entity) is partitioned by different values of a common attribute (Figure 2b). For example, the entity EMPLOYEE is a generalization of ENGINEER, SECRETARY, and TECHNICIAN."* The preceding text clearly illustrates a link in the first ER domain, which could be an ENGINEER, SECRETARY, or TECHNICIAN.)(Page 201, paragraph 4); if there is the first generalization, determining parent ER domain and child ER domain for the first generalization, the parent and child ER domains corresponding to corresponding parent and child design domains (i.e. *"A generalization hierarchy occurs when an entity (which we call the generic entity) is partitioned by different values of a common attribute (Figure 2b). For example, the entity EMPLOYEE is a generalization of ENGINEER, SECRETARY, and TECHNICIAN."* The preceding text clearly indicates that the parent design domain may be the ENGINEER, SECRETARY, and TECHNICIAN and the child domain is an EMPLOYEE.)(Page 201, paragraph 4); and creating inheritance link from the corresponding child design domain to the corresponding parent design domain (Figure 5 illustrates the inheritance link between the student, club, and school, where belongs-to, located-in, and attends are links between the domains.)(Figure 5).

As per claims 8, Teorey teaches a method wherein processing ER entities comprises: for a first ER entity included in the first ER model, creating a corresponding first design entity in the corresponding first design model (i.e. *"On the basis of a categorization of extended ER constructs and a set of mapping rules, each relationship and its associated entities are transformed into a set of candidate relations."* The preceding text clearly illustrates that the first ER entity in the first ER model is the ER construct, creating a corresponding design entity is the transformation of

the relationship into a set of candidate relations using the set of mapping rules. That is, for each ER entity, the transformation creates a parallel design entity in the relational database.)(Page 199, paragraph 2); determining first ER subject areas associated with the first ER entity, the first ER subject areas corresponding to first design subject areas (i.e. *"On the basis of a categorization of extended ER constructs and a set of mapping rules, each relationship and its associated entities are transformed into a set of candidate relations."* With the set of mapping rules contains the subject area of which the first ER entity will correspond to the design entity of the relational database. An ordinary person skilled on the art would understand that each relationship and its associated entities would include the subject area of the ER entity, when creating the subject area of the design entity.)(Page 199, paragraph 2); adding the corresponding first design entity as a member of the corresponding first design subject areas (i.e. *"On the basis of a categorization of extended ER constructs and a set of mapping rules, each relationship and its associated entities are transformed into a set of candidate relations."* Based on the reasoning above the set of mapping rules contains the corresponding first design entity as a member of the corresponding first design subject area.)(Page 199, paragraph 2); and processing attributes associated with the first ER entity (i.e. *"On the basis of a categorization of extended ER constructs and a set of mapping rules, each relationship and its associated entities are transformed into a set of candidate relations."* The transformation of the relationship establishes that the processing of attributes associated with the first ER entity.)(Page 199, paragraph 2).

As per claims 9, Teorey teaches a method wherein processing attributes associated with the first ER entity comprises: creating a first design attribute to correspond to the first ER attribute (i.e. *"Attach attributes to entities that describe most directly. For example, attribute OFFICE-BUILDING should be an attribute of the entity DEPARTMENT instead of the entity EMPLOYEE."* "Our example is drawn from a company personnel and project database EER schema, illustrated in Figure 7 (Section 2.2), which indicates the transformation of all types of EER

*constructs to relations*" The preceding text clearly indicates that an ER attribute is created and then corresponds to a design attribute based on Figure 8.)(page 204, paragraph 8); attaching the design attribute to the first design entity (i.e. *"Attach attributes to entities that describe most directly. For example, attribute OFFICE-BUILDING should be an attribute of the entity DEPARTMENT instead of the entity EMPLOYEE."* *"On the basis of a categorization of extended ER constructs and a set of mapping rules, each relationship and its associated entities are transformed into a set of candidate relations."*)(page 204, paragraph 8; page 199, paragraph 2); setting type reference of the first design attribute (i.e. *"Attach attributes to entities that describe most directly. For example, attribute OFFICE-BUILDING should be an attribute of the entity DEPARTMENT instead of the entity EMPLOYEE."* *"On the basis of a categorization of extended ER constructs and a set of mapping rules, each relationship and its associated entities are transformed into a set of candidate relations."*)(page 204, paragraph 8; page 199, paragraph 2); determining whether the first ER attribute is part of a first ER primary key associated with the first ER entity (i.e. *"The many-to-many relationship, shown here as totally optional, requires a relationship relation with primary keys of both entities (Figure 8f). The same transformation applies to either the optional or mandatory case."*)(pages 208-210, paragraph 10); and if the first ER attribute is part of the first ER primary key, flagging the first design attribute as pad of a first design primary key associated with the first design entity.

As per claims 10, Teorey teaches a method wherein processing entity subtype relationships comprises: determining whether there is a first CWM generalization that links two of the ER entities in the first ER model (i.e. *"The transformation of disjoint subset generalization produces a separate relation for the whole set (the generic entity) and each of the subsets."*)(Page 210, paragraph 4); if there is the first CWM generalization, determining parent and child ER entities for the first CWM generalization, the parent and child ER

entities corresponding to corresponding parent and child design entities (i.e. "A generalization hierarchy occurs when an entity (which we call the generic entity) is partitioned by different values of a common attribute (Figure 2b). For example, the entity EMPLOYEE is a generalization of ENGINEER, SECRETARY, and TECHNICIAN." The preceding text clearly indicates that the parent design domain may be the ENGINEER, SECRETARY, and TECHNICIAN and the child domain is an EMPLOYEE.)(Page 201, paragraph 4); and creating inheritance link from the corresponding child design entity to the corresponding parent design entity (Figure 5 illustrates the inheritance link between the student, club, and school, where belongs-to, located-in, and attends are links between the domains.)(Figure 5).

As per claims 11, Teorey teaches a method wherein processing non-subtype relationships comprises: obtaining references to parent and child ER entities in a first ER relationship, the parent and child ER entities corresponding to parent and child design entities in the first design model (i.e. "Entity relation with the embedded foreign key of the parent entity. This transformation always occurs with binary relationships that are one to many for the entity on the many (child) side and the one to one for the entities, and with a unary relationship that is one to one or one to many for each entity")(Page 208, paragraph 5); creating a corresponding design link between the corresponding parent and child design entities in the first design model (Figure 5 illustrates the design link between the student, club, and school, where belongs-to, located-in, and attends are links between the domains.)(Figure 5); setting cardinality and relationship type for the corresponding design link (i.e. "The actual number associated with the term "many" is called the cardinality of the connectivity. Cardinality may be represented by upper and lower bounds. Figure 3 shows the basic constricts for connectivity: one to one (unary or binary relationship) one to many (unary or binary relationship), and many to many (unary or binary relationship).")(Page 201, paragraph 9);



determining whether first ER relationship has at least one referential rule (i.e. *"We now look at each EER construct in more detail to see how each transformation rule is defined and applied."* The preceding text clearly indicates that at least one transformation rule is defined and applied, where the transformation rule is a referential rule.)(Page 208, paragraph 2); and if the first ER relationship has at least one referential rule, processing the at least one referential rule (i.e. *"On the basis of a categorization of extended ER constructs and a set of mapping rules, each relationship and its associated entities are transformed into a set of candidate relations."*)(Page 199, paragraph 2).

As per claims 12, Teorey teaches a method wherein processing the at least one referential rule comprises; obtaining parameters including "inset" "update" and "delete" from the CWM; setting corresponding parameters for the corresponding design link (Figure 5 illustrates the design link between the student, club, and school, where belongs-to, located-in, and attends are links between the domains.)(Figure 5); determining whether there is an ER attribute in the child ER entity that has migrated from the parent ER entity (i.e. *"Entity relation with the embedded foreign key of the parent entity. This transformation always occurs with binary relationships that are one to many for the entity on the many (child) side and the one to one for the entities, and with a unary relationship that is one to one or one to many for each entity"*)(Page 208, paragraph 5); and if there is such an ER attribute corresponding to a design attribute, then: creating a design foreign key under the child design entity (i.e. *"In both the mandatory case (Figure 9a) and the optional case (Figure 9b) the pairing entity key appears as a foreign key in the resulting relation"* The preceding text clearly indicates that the resulting relation is the design entity and the foreign key is the design foreign key.)(Page 210, paragraph 1); and creating references to the corresponding design attribute (i.e. *"In both cases the two key attributes are taken from the same domain but are given different names to designate their unique use."*)(Page 210, paragraph 1).

Teorey does not teach a method wherein processing the at least one referential rule comprises; obtaining parameters including "inset" "update" and "delete" from the CWM.

Farpinyo teaches a method wherein processing the at least one referential rule comprises; obtaining parameters including "inset" "update" and "delete" from the CWM (i.e. "ER Editor – This is the editor for designing physical data models with ER diagrams based on CODASYL [8]. It is also a GUI of ER2CWM; database designers can create CWM Relational metadata, select DBMSes to create database schemas, or create CWM Relational metadata and ER diagrams from existing relational databases." The preceding text clearly illustrates that an ER editor would contain an insert, update and delete parameters, which when selecting these commands would be a referential rule.)(Page 459, paragraph 1).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Teorey with the teachings of Farpinyo to include a method wherein processing the at least one referential rule comprises; obtaining parameters including "inset" "update" and "delete" from the CWM with the motivation to facilitate database design, creation, and maintenance via a standard CWM format that can also be ported for use in other environments. (Farpinyo, Abstract).

As per claim 14, Teorey does not explicitly teach a method wherein converting logical aspects comprises the operations of: (a) scanning through the ER libraries; (b) for a first of the ER libraries, creating a corresponding first design library; (c) for each of the ER models in the first ER library, creating a corresponding design model in the corresponding first design library to hold corresponding information; (d) processing each

of the ER models to produce corresponding information for the corresponding design model; (e) determining if there are any references between the ER models; and (f) if there are any references between the ER models, specifying corresponding references in corresponding design models; and wherein converting physical aspects comprises: (g) scanning through the relational catalogs; (h) for a first of the relational catalogs, creating a corresponding first DBMS catalog in the relational database; (i) for each of the relational schemas in the first relational catalog, creating a corresponding DBMS schema in the corresponding DBMS catalog to hold corresponding information; and (j) processing each of the relational schemas to produce corresponding information for the corresponding DBMS schema.

Farpinyo teaches a method wherein converting logical aspects comprises the operations of: (a) scanning through the ER libraries (i.e. *"DBMS Information – This module, via JDBC, creates database schema from CWM Relational metadata, reads in existing database schemas to create CWM Relational metadata and ER diagrams, and maintains information about DBMSes that ER2CWM supports, i.e. SQL data types and database commands for creating and reading in schemas. DBMSes on which ER2CWM have been tested are Sybase Adaptive Server v.11.9.2 [9] and Microsoft SQL Server 2000 [10]. Other DBMSes can be supported by providing ER2CWM with .jar files that contain corresponding DBMS information."* The preceding text clearly indicates that ER2CWM supports SQL data types and database commands for creating and reading schemas. It is clear that in order to create and read schemas, scanning of ER libraries must be performed. Figure 3 clearly illustrates such example.) (Page 459, paragraph 3); (b) for a first of the ER libraries, creating a corresponding first design library; (c) for each of the ER models in the first ER library, creating a corresponding design model in the corresponding first design library to hold corresponding information; (d) processing each of the ER models to produce

Art Unit: 2165

corresponding information for the corresponding design model; (e) determining if there are any references between the ER models; and (f) if there are any references between the ER models, specifying corresponding references in corresponding design models; and wherein converting physical aspects comprises: (g) scanning through the relational catalogs; (h) for a first of the relational catalogs, creating a corresponding first DBMS catalog in the relational database; (i) for each of the relational schemas in the first relational catalog, creating a corresponding DBMS schema in the corresponding DBMS catalog to hold corresponding information; and (j) processing each of the relational schemas to produce corresponding information for the corresponding DBMS schema (For the remainder of steps b-j are steps found in the user manual of the ER2CWM tool.)(Page 461, paragraph 1).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Teorey with the teachings of Farpinyo to include a method wherein converting logical aspects comprises the operations of: (a) scanning through the ER libraries; (b) for a first of the ER libraries, creating a corresponding first design library; (c) for each of the ER models in the first ER library, creating a corresponding design model in the corresponding first design library to hold corresponding information; (d) processing each of the ER models to produce corresponding information for the corresponding design model; (e) determining if there are any references between the ER models; and (f) if there are any references between the ER models, specifying corresponding references in corresponding design models; and wherein converting physical aspects comprises: (g) scanning through the relational

catalogs; (h) for a first of the relational catalogs, creating a corresponding first DBMS catalog in the relational database; (i) for each of the relational schemas in the first relational catalog, creating a corresponding DBMS schema in the corresponding DBMS catalog to hold corresponding information; and (j) processing each of the relational schemas to produce corresponding information for the corresponding DBMS schema with the motivation to facilitate database design, creation, and maintenance via a standard CWM format that can also be ported for use in other environments. (Farpinyo, Abstract).

#### ***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farhan M. Syed whose telephone number is 571-272-7191. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00 PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/716,286  
Art Unit: 2165

Page 29

FMS



JEFFREY GAFFIN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100